1   16 (Twice Amended) An apparatus for reproduction of compressed digital images at a

2   plurality of speeds, said apparatus comprising:

3   a storage device having stored therein compressed program records, each

4   program record containing multiple versions of said each program, and tables of

5   predetermined temporally similar addresses within each version of said each program

6   record for selection therebetween at different [play] ones of said plurality of speeds;

7   [transducing means] a transducer for reproducing images from said

8   compressed program records; and,

9   control means responsive to user program and play speed selection for

10   selecting one of said program records, and additionally responsive to user determined play

11   speed for reading said tables of predetermined addresses and [generating] accessing said

12   predetermined addresses within said one program record for [transducing] reproducing one

13   of said multiple versions of said one program in [correspondence] accordance with said

14   user determined play speed.

REMARKS

Claims 13 and 14 are amended to depend from claim 12. Claim 16 is amended to provide additional clarity.

Rejection of Claims 1 - 10 and 13 - 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1 - 10 and 13 - 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lane et al. (US Patent 5,933,567) in view of McLaren (US Patent 6,064,794).

US Patent 6,064,794 to McLaren et al. is not available as prior art reference because it shares the same PCT filing date, March 8, 1996 as this application. Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 - 10 and 13 – 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Rejection of Claims 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lane et al. (US Patent 5,933,567) in view of Abecassis (US Patent 6,091,886).

In claim 16, as amended twice, applicants recite an apparatus for reproduction of compressed digital images at a plurality of speeds. The apparatus comprises a storage device having stored therein compressed program records. Each program record containing multiple versions of the program, and tables of predetermined temporally similar addresses within each version of the program record for selection therebetween at different ones of the plurality of speeds. A transducing means reproduces images from the compressed program records. A control means is responsive to user program and play speed selection for selecting one of the program records. The control means is additionally responsive to user determined play speed for reading the tables of predetermined addresses and accessing said predetermined addresses within said one program record for reproducing one of said multiple versions of said one program in accordance with said user determined play speed.

Stated differently, claim 16 recites a storage device with compressed program records. Each program record contains multiple versions of the program and tables of predetermined addresses within each version that identify temporally similar occurrences within each program version. A controller allows the user to select a specific program for reproduction and facilitates selecting between the versions of the program using the predetermined addresses to ensure that similar temporal program content events are abutted.

The Examiner, at page 7 of the action asserts that,

"...Lane discloses the claimed,
    a) storage device (see claim 8 discussions), and each program containing tables of predetermined temporally similar addresses within each program record for selection between different play speeds (see col .55, line 59 to col. 57, line 67)..."

This assertion is incorrect because Lane makes no mention nor suggestion of applicants' recited claim 16 storage device,

"..having stored therein compressed program records, each program record containing multiple versions of said each program...".

Furthermore the Examiners citation of Lane is directed to "track mapping" and sync block identification. Lane teaches use of a track map lookup table (1610), column 57 lines 14 - 19 and discloses that the TRACK MAP employs a numerical equation for calculation to determine the track where the head should be positioned. Furthermore use of the TRACK MAP identifies the sync block which MAY contain trick play data corresponding to the

selected trick play speed (column 57 lines 55), and further track error signal generation ensues to determine which one of the heads should be passing over the required track.

Clearly Lane's lookup table of numerical equations for calculation in real time during reproduction, cannot be considered to represent applicants' predetermined temporally similar addresses as recited, wherein;

> "...tables of predetermined temporally similar addresses within each version of said each program record for selection therebetween at different ones of said plurality of speeds...".

The Examiner admits that Lane lacks applicants program records, where each program record contains multiple versions. However, in addition, Lane's look up table <u>only facilitates real time calculation</u> of track / head placement and fails to disclose or suggest applicants' tables of predetermined, temporally similar addresses within each program version.

The Examiner asserts,

> "It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Lane by realizing Lane with the means providing multiple versions of the same program, as taught by Abecassis, which the desirable advantage of, for example, both the parent and child viewing different versions of the same program."

However this assertion is without any support in the teachings of Lane. Although Lane teaches trick play reproduction and uses a track map for "real time calculation of trick play data locations", Lane makes no mention nor suggestion of storing program records as applicants recite, which contain multiple versions of each program. Hence one of ordinary skill, familiar with Lane can find <u>no</u> motivation to modify Lane with the teachings of Abecassis.

Applicants' respectfully suggest that such teachings of multiple versions of each program with predetermined temporally similar addresses stored in tables is impermissibly derived from applicants' own disclosure.

However, assuming <u>argeundo</u> the Examiner's suggested obvious modification of Lane with Abecassis, the resulting combination fails to realize applicants recited claim 16 utility. Specifically, Abecassis teaches the use of different program <u>pieces</u> which are seamlessly assembled during reproduction to provide a program having a desired content rating. However, Abecassis makes no mention of each program record containing multiple versions for reproduction at <u>different speeds</u> with selection between each version controlled by tables of

predetermined temporally similar program addresses. Furthermore the Examiner's asserts that the obvious modification provides a benefit of "increasing the dynamic range of Lane". This statement is unclear as to the technological basis of "dynamic range" and is irrelevant with regard to that which applicants' recite in claim 16.

Since Lane provides no motivation to one of ordinary skill, and discloses lookup tables which facilitate real time calculation but not applicants predetermined temporally similar program addresses; and Abecassis teaches user controlled selection of different program pieces, applicants' claim 16 is not rendered obvious by either reference singly or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 depends from claim 16 and is, for the same reasons not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Examiners combination. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made every effort to place claims 1 - 10 and 13 - 17 in condition for allowance which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted
Gilles Boccon-Gibod et al.

December 11, 2000

By: Francis A. Davenport
Francis A. Davenport
Reg. No. 36,316
(609) 734-9864

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing, Inc.
P.O. Box 5312,
Princeton,
NJ 08543-0028